

On Characterizing weak defining hyperplanes (weak Facets) in DEA with Constant Returns to Scale Technology

Darius Akbarian *

Department of Mathematics, Arak Branch, Islamic Azad University, Arak, Iran.

Abstract

The Production Possibility Set (PPS) is defined as a set of inputs and outputs of a system in which inputs can produce outputs. The Production Possibility Set of the Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) model is contain of two types defining hyperplanes (facets); strong and weak efficient facets. In this paper, the problem of finding weak defining hyperplanes of the PPS of the CCR-technology is dealt with. We state and prove some properties relative to our method. To illustrate the applicability of the proposed model, some numerical examples are finally provided. Our algorithm can easily be implemented using existing packages for operation research, such as GAMS.

Keywords: Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA); Production Possibility Set; Efficient frontier; Weak efficient frontier; Hyperplane.

1 Introduction

The Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA), introduced by Charnes, Cooper and Rhodes (CCR) (1978), is a procedure to evaluate the relative efficiency of a set of decision making units (DMU); each uses multiple inputs to produce multiple outputs. The data define a Production Possibility Set (PPS); that can be used to evaluate the efficiency of each of DMUs. The PPS of the DEA models is the smallest set containing the observed DMUs and all feasible inputoutput level

*Corresponding author,

E-mail address: d_akbarian@yahoo.com, d-akbarian@iau-arak.ac.ir *Fax:* 0098-861-3120532

correspondences pertaining to the production process operated by the DMUs. The PPS of the CCR model is the intersection of a finite number of halfspace, whose defining hyperplanes pass through the origin. The defining hyperplanes (facets) of the PPS of the CCR model are divided into two categories, including *i*) strong defining hyperplanes, and *ii*) weak defining hyperplanes. One of the problems in DEA is to find the equations of these defining hyperplanes. There are many researches undertaken on the subject of finding *strong* defining hyperplanes (see for example Amirteimoori et al. (2005), Amirteimoori et al. (2012), M. Davtalab-Olyaie et al. (2014), Jahanshahloo et al. (2007), Jahanshahloo et al. (2005a), Yu et al. (1996), Wei et al. (2007) and Olesen et al. (2003)). However, less attention has been paid about finding *weak* defining hyperplanes of the PPS of the CCR model (see Wei et al. (2007)). In this regard, Jahanshahloo et al. (2010), proposed a method for determining weak defining hyperplanes of the PPS of the BCC model. In this paper we provide a method to find *weak* defining hyperplanes of the PPS of the CCR model.

Using the method proposed by Jahanshahloo et al. (2007) (with some modifications) we introduce a method to find the equations of *weak* defining hyperplanes of the PPS of the CCR model. The idea to find weak defining hyperplanes is straightforward by adding artificial weak efficient DMUs, named weak efficient virtual DMUs in this paper. The key is how to define these artificial weak efficient DMUs, and it is done by testing all CCR-efficient DMUs by a variance of super-efficiency models (see models (5) and (6))(after eliminating all CCR-inefficient DMUs from the PPS) and determining all extreme DMUs that lie on the some weak efficient defining hyperplanes. A supporting hyperplane is found to be a weak defining hyperplane if at least one artificial DMU lies on it. Using this method, it is possible to check (i) which CCR-efficient DMUs lie on the extreme rays (edges) of the PPS of the CCR model, (ii) which extreme DMUs lie on the some weak defining hyperplanes of the PPS of the CCR model, (iii) how many weak and strong defining hyperplanes they are on. Moreover, there are many PPS of DEA models that don't have any strong defining hyperplanes (see Figure 2 and remark 2). Also, these hyperplanes are useful in sensitivity and stability analysis (see Jahanshahloo et al. (2005b)). Finally, the alternative optimal solutions of the models (3) and (4) can be found using the proposed method. These may show the importance of obtaining the weak defining hyperplanes of the PPS of DEA model. Some useful facts related to the properties of models (5) and (6) are stated and proved. In addition, three numerical examples are provided.

2 Background

Consider a set of n DMUs which is associated with m inputs and s outputs. Particularly, each $DMU_j = (X_j, Y_j)$ ($j \in J = \{1, \dots, n\}$) consumes amount $x_{ij}(> 0)$ of input i and produces amount $y_{rj}(> 0)$ of output r . The production possibility set T , $T \subset \{(X, Y) | X \in E^m, Y \in E^s, X \geq 0, Y \geq 0\}$ is based on postulate sets which are presented with a brief explanation (see Banker (1984), Banker et al. (1984) and Yu et al. (1996)). One of the DEA models to evaluate the relative efficiency of a set of DMUs is the CCR model, which is, proposed by Charnes et al. (1978). The production possibility set (PPS) of the CCR model can be defined as follows:

$$T = \left\{ (X, Y) | X \geq \sum_{j \in J} \lambda_j X_j, Y \leq \sum_{j \in J} \lambda_j Y_j, \lambda_j \geq 0, j \in J \right\}.$$

in which X_j and Y_j are vectors of input and output of DMU_j , respectively.

Following properties are postulated for PPS T :

1. The observed activities belongs to T ; i.e.

$$(X_j, Y_j) \in T, j = 1, \dots, n$$

2. If $(X, Y) \in T$, then the $(tX, tY) \in T$ for any $t > 0$.

3. For any activity $(X, Y) \in T$ any nonnegative activity (\bar{X}, \bar{Y}) with $\bar{X} \geq X$ and $\bar{Y} \leq Y$ is included in T .

4. T is closed and convex.

A *face* of a polyhedral set is the support set of a supporting hyperplane.

A *facet* of a k -dimensional polyhedral set is a $k - 1$ dimensional face. In fact, any facet of the PPS of the DEA model is a defining hyperplane of the PPS.

Note: A CCR-efficient DMU is said to be *extreme* DMU; if it lies on the edge of the PPS of the CCR model.

The PPS of the CCR model is depicted in Figure (1). In Figure (1), DMUs D_1 and D_2 are extreme DMUs and CCR-efficient DMU D_3 , that lies on the strong defining hyperplane H_1 is non-extreme DMUs.

The input-oriented CCR model, corresponds to DMU_k , $k \in J$, is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \theta - \epsilon \left(\sum_{i=1}^m s_i^- + \sum_{r=1}^s s_r^+ \right) \\
s.t. \quad & \sum_{j \in J} \lambda_j y_{rj} - s_r^+ = y_{rk}, \quad r = 1, \dots, s \\
& \sum_{j \in J} \lambda_j x_{ij} + s_i^- = \theta x_{ik}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\
& \lambda_j \geq 0, \quad j \in J \\
& s_i^- \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\
& s_r^+ \geq 0, \quad r = 1, \dots, s \\
& \theta \quad \text{free}
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Also, the output-oriented CCR model, corresponds to DMU_k , $k \in J$, is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & \varphi + \epsilon \left(\sum_{i=1}^m t_i^- + \sum_{r=1}^s t_r^+ \right) \\
s.t. \quad & \sum_{j \in J} \lambda_j y_{rj} - t_r^+ = \varphi y_{rk}, \quad r = 1, \dots, s \\
& \sum_{j \in J} \lambda_j x_{ij} + t_i^- = x_{ik}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\
& \lambda_j \geq 0, \quad j \in J \\
& t_i^- \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\
& t_r^+ \geq 0, \quad r = 1, \dots, s \\
& \varphi \quad \text{free}
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where ϵ is non-Archimedean small and positive number. Models (1) and (2) are called envelopment forms (with non-Archimedean number).

DMU_k is said to be *strong efficient* (*CCR-efficient*) if and only if either (i) or (ii) happen:

$$(i) \quad \theta^* = 1 \text{ and } (\mathbf{s}^{+*}, \mathbf{s}^{-*}) = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$$

$$(ii) \quad \varphi^* = 1 \text{ and } (\mathbf{t}^{+*}, \mathbf{t}^{-*}) = (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$$

DMU_k is said to be *weak efficient* if and only if either (v) or (iv) happen:

$$(v) \quad \theta^* = 1 \text{ and } (\mathbf{s}^{+*}, \mathbf{s}^{-*}) \neq (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$$

$$(iv) \quad \varphi^* = 1 \text{ and } (\mathbf{t}^{+*}, \mathbf{t}^{-*}) \neq (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0})$$

Note that if $\theta^* < 1$ and $\varphi^* > 1$ then DMU_k is an interior point of the PPS.¹

Each interior DMU and weak efficient DMU in the CCR model is said to be a *CCR-inefficient DMU*.

Efficient Frontier is the set of all points (real or virtual DMUs) with efficiency score is equal to unity ($\theta^* = 1$ or $\varphi^* = 1$).

Efficient frontier is divided into two categories:

- i) *Strong efficient frontier* is the set of all (real or virtual) strong efficient (CCR efficient) DMU.
- ii) *Weak efficient frontier* in which all it's relative interior points (real or virtual DMUs), are weak efficient DMUs.

$DMU_k = (X_k, Y_k)$ is said to be *non-dominated* if and only if there is not any $DMU = (X, Y)$ (real or virtual) such that:

$$(-X_k, Y_k) \geq (-X, Y) \text{ and } (-X_k, Y_k) \neq (-X, Y).$$

We use the following theorem in the next section.

Theorem 1: *There does not exist any virtual DMU (a member of the PPS) that dominates an DEA-efficient DMU.*

Proof. See H. Fukuyama et. al. (2012).

The dual of models (1) and (2) (without ϵ i.e. $\epsilon=0$), which are called multiplier forms, are as models (3) and (4), respectively:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max \quad \sum_{r=1}^s u_r y_{rk} \\
& s.t. \quad \sum_{r=1}^s u_r y_{rj} - \sum_{i=1}^m v_i x_{ij} \leq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, n \\
& \quad \quad \sum_{i=1}^m v_i x_{ik} = 1, \\
& \quad \quad u_r \geq 0, \quad r = 1, \dots, s \\
& \quad \quad v_i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

¹(*) is used for optimal solution.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min \quad \sum_{i=1}^m v_i x_{ik} \\
& s.t. \quad \sum_{i=1}^m v_i x_{ij} - \sum_{r=1}^s u_r y_{rj} \geq 0, \quad j = 1, \dots, n \\
& \quad \sum_{r=1}^s u_r y_{rk} = 1, \\
& \quad u_r \geq 0, \quad r = 1, \dots, s \\
& \quad v_i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, m.
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

DMU_k is strong efficient if there exists at least one optimal solution (u^*, v^*) for (3) with $(u^*, v^*) > \mathbf{0}$, and $u^* y_k = 1$ in which $u^* = (u_1^*, u_2^*, \dots, u_s^*)$ and $v^* = (v_1^*, v_2^*, \dots, v_m^*)$. Also DMU_k is weak efficient if $u^* y_k = 1$ and no $(u^*, v^*) > \mathbf{0}$ exists. In this case there exist at least one r (or i) so that $u_r^* = 0$ (or $v_i^* = 0$) in all optimal solution of model (3) or (4) (see example 4.3.). In Figure (1), DMUs D_1 , D_2 and D_3 are strong efficient and D'_2 is weak efficient DMU. The evaluation of D_3 and D'_2 shows that, model (3) has unique optimal solution, which defines two supporting² defining hyperplanes H_1 and H_2 passing through D_3 and D'_2 , respectively. On the other hand, the evaluation of D_1 indicate that, model (3) has alternative optimal solutions, which defines an infinite number of supporting hyperplanes passing through D_1 . Only two of these hyperplanes (i.e. H_1 and H_3) are defining hyperplanes. In fact, if (u^*, v^*) is an *unique* optimal solution of model (3) then $u^{t*} y - v^{t*} x = 0$ is the equation of *defining* hyperplane of the PPS. In addition, if $(u^*, v^*) > \mathbf{0}$, $u^{t*} y - v^{t*} x = 0$ is the equation of *strong* defining hyperplane of the PPS (see Definition 1). Otherwise, if some components of (u^*, v^*) are zero, then $u^{t*} y - v^{t*} x = 0$ is the equation of *weak* defining hyperplane of the PPS (see Definition 2). A similar discussion holds for model (4).

Note that the hyperplanes H_2 and H_3 are weak defining hyperplanes and H_1 is strong defining hyperplane of the PPS of the CCR (see Definitions 1 and 2.).

In this paper, corresponding to each strong efficient DMU $DMU_j = (x_{1j}, \dots, x_{mj}, y_{1j}, \dots, y_{sj})$ we consider virtual DMUs $DMU'_j = (x_{1j}, \dots, x_{lj} + \alpha, \dots, x_{mj}, y_{1j}, \dots, y_{sj})$ and $DMU''_j = (x_{1j}, \dots, x_{mj}, y_{1j}, \dots, y_{qj} - \gamma, \dots, y_{sj})$, in which $\alpha, \gamma > 0$. These virtual DMUs are either interior point of the PPS of the CCR model or lie on the some weak defining hyperplanes (see Definition 2 and properties 2-7). In the latter case we call these virtual DMUs as “*weak efficient virtual DMU*”, hereafter. (See $DMU D'_2$ in Figure 1 and $DMUs D'_1, D''_1$ in Figure 2, for example).

²For definition and properties see Bazaraa et al. (1990).

Definition 1. The supporting hyperplane $H = \{(x, y) | \bar{u}^t y - \bar{v}^t x = 0, (\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \geq 0, (\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \neq 0\}$ of the PPS of the CCR model is strong defining hyperplane of the PPS if only if it is “defining” and $m + s - 1$ (=the number of outputs and inputs minus one) strong efficient DMUs of the PPS, which are linear independent, lie on H . (In this case, all components of (\bar{u}, \bar{v}) are positive.)

Definition 2. The supporting hyperplane $H = \{(x, y) | \bar{u}^t y - \bar{v}^t x = 0, (\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \geq 0, (\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \neq 0\}$ of the PPS of the CCR model is weak defining hyperplane of the PPS if and only if it is “defining” and $m + s - 1$ weak efficient virtual and strong efficient DMUs of the PPS, which are linear independent, lie on H . (In this case, some components of (\bar{u}, \bar{v}) are zero.)

Remark 1: In the equation of weak defining hyperplane, if $\bar{u}_q = 0$ (or $\bar{v}_l = 0$), then, this hyperplane is vertical to hyperplane $y_q = 0$ (or $x_l = 0$). In the case of $x_l = 0$, the weak defining hyperplane passes through of l^{th} axis of input.

Remark 2: If the number of strong efficient DMUs are less than $m + s - 1$ then all defining hyperplanes of the PPS are weak defining hyperplanes (because, by Definition 1, at least $m + s - 1$ strong efficient DMUs are needed to construct strong defining hyperplane).

In this research, we first find the extreme DMUs of the PPS of the CCR model, lying on the some weak defining hyperplanes, and then using models (5) and (6), the foregone weak efficient virtual DMUs are found. By using them, we find the weak defining hyperplane of the PPS of the CCR model.

Throughout this paper, we must assume that there are not any two strong efficient DMUs as (x, y) and (tx, ty) for all $t > 0$ and $t \neq 1$. Otherwise, one of them must be deleted.

3 Identifying equations of weak defining hyperplanes

In this section, we identify the equations of weak defining hyperplanes of the PPS of the CCR model in the following way. First, we evaluate each DMU_k , ($k \in J$) using, models (1) or (2). Then, we hold all CCR-efficient DMUs, and remove other DMUs. Suppose that the set of all CCR-efficient DMUs is denoted by E . Corresponding to each $DMU_k =$

$(x_{1k}, \dots, x_{mk}, y_{1k}, \dots, y_{sk})$, $(k \in E)$, we solve the following models:

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \theta_l^k \\
s.t. \quad & \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^k x_{lj} \leq \theta_l^k x_{lk} \\
& \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^k x_{ij} \leq x_{ik}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \quad i \neq l \\
& \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^k y_{rj} \geq y_{rk}, \quad r = 1, \dots, s \\
& \lambda_j^k \geq 0, \quad j \in E - \{k\} \\
& \theta_l^k \quad \text{free} \quad l = 1, \dots, m
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\max \quad & \varphi_q^k \\
s.t. \quad & \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \mu_j^k x_{ij} \leq x_{ik}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\
& \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \mu_j^k y_{qj} \geq \varphi_q^k y_{qk}, \\
& \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \mu_j^k y_{rj} \geq y_{rk}, \quad r = 1, \dots, s \quad r \neq q \\
& \mu_j^k \geq 0, \quad j \in E - \{k\} \\
& \varphi_q^k \quad \text{free} \quad q = 1, \dots, s
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The following properties hold for models (5) and (6). By property 1 we can find all extreme CCR-efficient DMUs. The properties 3, 4, 6, and 7 provide the necessary and sufficient conditions for lying an extreme CCR-efficient DMU on the weak defining hyperplane.

Property 1: *In model (5) (or (6)), if for some l (or q), $\theta_l^{k*} > 1$ (or $\varphi_q^{k*} < 1$) or if for some l (or q), model (5) (or model (6)) is infeasible, then, DMU_k is an extreme DMU and vice versa.*

Proof. Suppose that $\theta_l^{k*} > 1$. First, we show that DMU_k is CCR-efficient. By contradiction let DMU_k is inefficient. At optimality of model (1), two cases are happened:

(i) $\theta^* = 1$ and $(s^{+*}, s^{-*}) \neq \mathbf{0}$

(ii) $\theta^* < 1$

in each cases it can be shown that $\theta_l^{k*} \leq 1$, a contradiction.

Now we show that DMU_k is, in fact, an extreme CCR-efficient DMU. By contradiction suppose that DMU_k is a non-extreme CCR-efficient. So, the following system has solution:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in E'} \lambda_j x_j &= x_k, \\ \sum_{j \in E'} \lambda_j y_j &= y_k, \\ \lambda_j &\geq 0, j \in E' \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Suppose that $(\bar{\lambda}_j, j \in E')$ is a solution of the above system. If $\bar{\lambda}_j = 0$ then, $(\theta_l^k = 1, \lambda_j = \bar{\lambda}_j, j \in E' - \{k\})$ is a solution of model (5). Therefore, $\theta_l^{k*} \leq 1$, a contradiction. On the other hand if $\bar{\lambda}_j \neq 0$, we rewrite system (7) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in E' - \{k\}} \bar{\lambda}_j x_j &= (1 - \bar{\lambda}_j) x_k, \\ \sum_{j \in E' - \{k\}} \bar{\lambda}_j y_j &= (1 - \bar{\lambda}_j) y_k, \end{aligned}$$

By divided both side of the above equations by $(1 - \bar{\lambda}_j > 0)$; we obtain a solution of model (5) as $(\theta_l^k = 1, \lambda_j = \frac{\bar{\lambda}_j}{1 - \bar{\lambda}_j}, j \in E' - \{k\})$. Therefore, $\theta_l^{k*} \leq 1$, a contradiction. Thus, DMU_k is an extreme CCR-efficient DMU. Now, suppose that for some l , model (5) is infeasible. In the similar manner, it can be shown that DMU_k is an extreme CCR-efficient DMU. Conversely, suppose that DMU_k is extreme DMU and model (5) is feasible. We show that $\theta_l^{k*} \geq 1$. Consider the following corresponding to DMU_k :

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \theta_l'^k \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{j \in E'} \lambda_j^k x_{lj} + s_l^- = \theta_l'^k x_{lk} \\ & \sum_{j \in E'} \lambda_j^k x_{ij} + s_i^- = x_{ik}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \quad i \neq l \\ & \sum_{j \in E'} \lambda_j^k y_{rj} - s_r^+ = y_{rk}, \quad r = 1, \dots, s \\ & \lambda_j^k \geq 0, \quad j \in E' \\ & s_i^- \geq 0, s_r^+ \geq 0 \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad r = 1, \dots, s \\ & \theta_l'^k \text{ free} \quad l = 1, \dots, m \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Now suppose that $\theta^*(=1)$, $\theta_l'^{k*}$ and θ_l^{k*} are the optimal objective functions of the models (1), (8) and (5) with respect to DMU_k , respectively. It is not difficult to show that $\theta^* \leq \theta_l'^{k*} \leq \theta_l^{k*}$. Therefore, $\theta_l^{k*} \geq 1$. This completes the proof. \square

Corollary: In models (5) and (6), for each l and q , $\theta_l^{k*} = \varphi_q^{k*} = 1$ if and only if DMU_k is a non-extreme CCR-efficient DMU.

Proof. Omitted.

Property 2: In a single input case, for each $DMU_k = (x_{1k}, y_{1k}, \dots, y_{sk})$, the virtual DMU $DMU'_k = (x_{1k} + \alpha, y_{1k}, \dots, y_{sk})$, in which $\alpha > 0$, is an interior point of the PPS of the CCR model.

Proof. First, we add DMU'_k to the PPS and then, evaluate its performance by the input and output-oriented CCR model (see models (1) and (2)). It is enough to show that $\theta^* < 1$ and $\varphi^* > 1$. Consider the input-oriented CCR model corresponding to virtual DMU DMU'_k as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \quad & \theta \\
s.t. \quad & \sum_{j \in E} \lambda_j x_{1j} + \mu_k (x_{1k} + \alpha) \leq \theta (x_{1k} + \alpha), \\
& \sum_{j \in E} \lambda_j y_{rj} + \mu_k y_{rk} \geq y_{rk}, & r = 1, \dots, s \\
& \lambda_j \geq 0, & j \in E \\
& \theta & free
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

$(\bar{\lambda}_j = 0 (j \neq k), \bar{\lambda}_k = 1, \bar{\mu}_k = 0, \bar{\theta} = \frac{x_{1k}}{x_{1k} + \alpha} (< 1))$ is a feasible solution of (9). Since model (9) has a minimization-type objective function, $\theta^* < 1$; where “*” is used to indicate optimality. In a similar manner, it can be shown that in output-oriented maximization problem, $\varphi^* > 1$. Therefore, DMU_k is an interior point of PPS. This completes the proof. \square

In Figure 2, corresponding to DMU $D_1 = (x_{11}, y_{11}, y_{21})$, virtual DMU $D_1'' = (x_{11} + \alpha, y_{11}, y_{21})$ is an interior point of the PPS.

Property 3: In a multiple inputs case, if for some l , model (5) is infeasible, then CCR-efficient

DMU_k lies on the weak defining hyperplane, which passes through the l th axis of input.

Proof. We show that if for one l , model (5) is infeasible, then, virtual DMU $DMU'_k = (x_{1k}, \dots, x_{(l-1)k}, x_{lk} + \alpha, x_{(l+1)k}, \dots, x_{mk}, y_{1k}, \dots, y_{sk})$, in which $\alpha > 0$, is on the weak defining hyperplane, which passes through the l th axis of input. For this aim, we show that in the performance evaluation of DMU'_k using model (2); $\varphi^* = 1$. Consider model (2) corresponding to virtual DMU DMU'_k as follows (without ϵ):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max \quad \varphi \\
& s.t. \quad \sum_{j \in E} \lambda_j y_{rj} + \mu_k y_{rk} \geq \varphi y_{rk}, \quad r = 1, \dots, s \\
& \quad \sum_{j \in E} \lambda_j x_{ij} + \mu_k x_{ik} \leq x_{ik}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad i \neq l \\
& \quad \sum_{j \in E} \lambda_j x_{lj} + \mu_k (x_{lk} + \alpha) \leq x_{lk} + \alpha \\
& \quad \mu_k, \lambda_j \geq 0, \quad j \in E \\
& \quad \varphi \quad \quad \quad free
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

By contradiction, suppose that $(\lambda_j^* (j \in E), \mu_k^*, \varphi^* (> 1))$ is the optimal solution of (10). The constraints of model (10) can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^* y_{rj} > (1 - \lambda_k^* - \mu_k^*) y_{rk}, \quad r = 1, \dots, s \\
& \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^* x_{ij} \leq (1 - \lambda_k^* - \mu_k^*) x_{ik}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad i \neq l \\
& \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^* x_{lj} \leq (1 - \lambda_k^* - \mu_k^*) x_{lk} + (1 - \mu_k^*) \alpha
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

From model (11), it is easy to show that $1 - \lambda_k^* - \mu_k^* > 0$. Divide both sides of model (11) by $1 - \lambda_k^* - \mu_k^* > 0$ and define $\bar{\mu}_j = \frac{\lambda_j^*}{1 - \lambda_k^* - \mu_k^*}$, $j \in E - \{k\}$; so, model (11) becomes as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \bar{\mu}_j y_{rj} > y_{rk}, \quad r = 1, \dots, s \\
& \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \bar{\mu}_j x_{ij} \leq x_{ik}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad i \neq l \\
& \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \bar{\mu}_j x_{lj} \leq x_{lk} + \beta
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

in which $\beta = \left(\frac{1 - \mu_k^*}{1 - \lambda_k^* - \mu_k^*} \right) \alpha$. Since $\beta > 0$, there is $\hat{\theta} > 0$ so that $x_{lk} + \beta = \hat{\theta} x_{lk}$; therefore, the constraints of model (11) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \bar{\mu}_j y_{rj} &> y_{rk}, \quad r = 1, \dots, s \\ \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \bar{\mu}_j x_{ij} &\leq x_{ik}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad i \neq l \\ \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \bar{\mu}_j x_{lj} &\leq \hat{\theta} x_{lk} \end{aligned}$$

So, $(\bar{\mu}_j \ (j \in E - \{k\}), \hat{\theta})$ is a feasible solution for model (5); a contradiction. This implies that $\varphi^* = 1$ i.e. DMU'_k lies on the efficient frontier. Now, since DMU'_k is dominated by CCR-efficient DMU_k , so, DMU'_k lies on the weak efficient frontier (hyperplane). Moreover, it is easy to show that in the equation of this weak efficient hyperplane; $v_l = 0$ and so by remark 1 this hyperplane passes through the l th axis of input. This completes the proof. \square

In Figure 1, model (5) corresponding to DMU $D_2 = (x_{12}, x_{22}, y_2)$ with $l = 1$ is infeasible; so, virtual DMU $D'_2 = (x_{12} + \alpha, x_{22}, y_2)$ is on the weak defining hyperplane, which passes through x_1 -axis and vertical to hyperplane $x_1=0$.

The following property is, in fact, the converse of property 3.

Property 4: In a multiple inputs case, if extreme CCR-efficiency DMU $DMU_k = (x_{1k}, \dots, x_{lk}, \dots, x_{mk}, y_{1k}, \dots, y_{sk})$ lies on the weak defining hyperplane which passes through the l th axis of input (vertical to hyperplane $x_l=0$); then model (5) is infeasible.

Proof. By contradiction, suppose that the model (5) is feasible. The first constraint of the model (5) implies that the optimal solution of the model (5) is bounded. Suppose that, $(\theta_l^{k*}, \lambda_j^* \ (j \neq k))$ is an optimal solution of it. Note that the first constraint of the model (5) is tight at optimality. We first show that $\theta_l^{k*} > 1$. By contradiction, suppose that $\theta_l^{k*} \leq 1$. If

$\theta_l^{k*} < 1$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^{k*} x_{lj} &= \theta_l^{k*} x_{lk} < x_{lk} \\
\sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^{k*} x_{ij} &\leq x_{ik}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \quad i \neq l \\
\sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^{k*} y_{rj} &\geq y_{rk}, \quad r = 1, \dots, s
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

It shows that virtual DMU

$$\left(\sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^{k*} x_{lj}, \dots, \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^{k*} x_{lj}, \dots, \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^{k*} x_{mj}, \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^{k*} y_{1j}, \dots, \sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^{k*} y_{sj} \right)$$

dominates the CCR-efficient DMU_k , a contradiction (see Theorem 1). Now, if $\theta_l^{k*} = 1$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^{k*} x_{lj} &= x_{lk} \\
\sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^{k*} x_{ij} &\leq x_{ik}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \quad i \neq l \\
\sum_{j \in E - \{k\}} \lambda_j^{k*} y_{rj} &\geq y_{rk}, \quad r = 1, \dots, s
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

At least one of the inequality constraints of (14) is a strict inequality, because, otherwise, the CCR-efficient DMU_k , is not extreme DMU. So, $\theta_l^{k*} > 1$. Therefor, there exist $\beta > 0$ so that, $\theta_l^{k*} x_{lk} = x_{lk} + \beta$. This means that, the virtual DMU $DMU'_k = (x_{1k}, \dots, x_{(l-1)k}, x_{lk} + \beta, x_{(l+1)k}, \dots, x_{mk}, y_{1k}, \dots, y_{sk})$ is, in fact, an observed DMU belongs to the PPS of the CCR model. This is a contradiction. Because, we had been eliminated all the CCR-inefficient DMUs from the PPS of the CCR model. The proof is completed. □

Property 5: In a single output case, for each $DMU_k = (x_{1k}, \dots, x_{mk}, y_{1k})$, virtual DMU $DMU'_k = (x_{1k}, \dots, x_{mk}, y_{1k} - \gamma)$, in which $\gamma > 0$, is an interior point of the PPS of the CCR model.

Proof. The proof is similar to property 2 and so, we omit the details. □

In Figure 3, virtual DMU $D' = (x_1, x_2, y_1 - \gamma)$, corresponding to DMU $D = (x_1, x_2, y_1)$ is an interior point of PPS).

Property 6: In a multiple outputs case, if for some q , model (6) is infeasible, then, CCR-efficient DMU_k lies on the weak defining hyperplane of the PPS, vertical to hyperplane $y_q=0$.

Proof. The proof is similar to property 3 except it can be shown that in the performance evaluation of DMU'_k using model (1); $\theta^* = 1$. \square

In Figure 2, model (6) corresponding to DMU $D_1 = (x_{11}, y_{11}, y_{21})$, with $q = 2$, is infeasible, so, virtual DMU $D'_1 = (x_{11}, y_{11}, y_{21} - \gamma)$ lies on the weak defining hyperplane of the PPS vertical to hyperplane $y_2=0$.

The following property is, in fact, the converse of property 6.

Property 7: In a multiple outputs case, let extreme CCR-efficiency DMU $DMU_k = (x_{1k}, \dots, x_{mk}, y_{1k}, \dots, y_{qk}, \dots, y_{sk})$ lies on the weak defining hyperplane vertical to hyperplane $y_q = 0$; then model (6) is infeasible.

Proof. The proof is similar to property 4. So, we omit it.

Now, by property 1 we can find all extreme DMUs of the PPS of the CCR model and by Properties 2, 3 and 4 we can find all weak efficient virtual DMUs as $DMU'_k = (x_{1k}, \dots, x_{(l-1)k}, x_{lk} + \alpha, x_{(l+1)k}, \dots, x_{mk}, y_{1k}, \dots, y_{sk})$, in which $\alpha > 0$ and by Properties 5, 6 and 7 we can find all weak efficient virtual DMUs as $DMU'_k = (x_{1k}, \dots, x_{mk}, y_{1k}, \dots, y_{qk} - \beta, \dots, y_{sk})$, in which $\beta > 0$. Put indices of the weak efficient virtual DMUs, in F . Without lose of generality we can assume that $F \cup E = \{DMU_1, \dots, DMU_L\}$. Consider the set $G = \{1, \dots, L\}$. Now, we use the method proposed by Jahanshahloo et. al (2007) to find all weak defining hyperplanes of the PPS of the CCR model with some modifications. We modify their method for simplifying the process of finding coplanar DMUs. More importantly, we need the following theorems:

Theorem 2: *Let (x_p, y_p) and (x_q, y_q) be observed DMUs that lie on a strong (or weak) supporting hyperplane, then each convex combination of them is on the same hyperplane.*

Proof. See Jahanshahloo et. al (2007).

Theorem 3: Consider (x_p, y_p) and (x_q, y_q) are two observed DMUs that lie on different hyperplanes (excluding their intersection, if it is not empty). Then every point (virtual DMU) which is obtained by strict convex combination of them is an interior point of PPS. In other words, this virtual DMU is radial inefficient.

Proof. See Jahanshahloo et. al (2007).

The method is as follows:

Using the above Theorems we first determine all coplanar DMUs in G (i.e. all DMUs that are on the same defining hyperplane). Take a distinct pair DMU_p and DMU_q , where p and q belong to G , and construct a virtual DMU as follows: $DMU_k = \frac{1}{2}DMU_p + \frac{1}{2}DMU_q$. Using the DEA models, we can determine whether or not DMU_k is efficient. In the first case, by Theorem 3, DMU_p and DMU_q are on the same hyperplane; in the second case, they are not (by Theorem 2). For each $l \in G$, define $G_l = \{j \mid DMU_l \text{ and } DMU_j, j \in G, \text{ are coplanar}\}$. It is obvious that if $\{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_p\} \subseteq G_{l_1} \cap G_{l_2} \cap \dots \cap G_{l_p}$, then, DMUs l_1, l_2, \dots, l_p are coplanar.

Example. In Figure (4), 1, 2, ..., 6 are six DMUs. Since there exists a plane that binding from 1 and 2, therefore $1 \in G_2$ and $2 \in G_1$ and so on. Then, $G_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $G_2 = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, $G_3 = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, $G_4 = \{2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$, $G_5 = \{2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$, $G_6 = \{4, 5, 6\}$.

$\{1, 2, 3\} \subseteq G_1 \cap G_2 \cap G_3$ therefor, DMUs 1, 2, 3, are coplanar.

$\{2, 3, 4, 5\} \subseteq G_2 \cap G_3 \cap G_4 \cap G_5$ therefor, DMUs 2, 3, 4, 5 are coplanar.

$\{4, 5, 6\} \subseteq G_4 \cap G_5 \cap G_6$ therefor, DMUs 4, 5, 6 are coplanar.

We choose an arbitrary $m + s - 1$ members of G such that $\{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{m+s-1}\} \subseteq G_{l_1} \cap G_{l_2} \cap \dots \cap G_{l_{m+s-1}}$. We call this set $D = \{j_1, \dots, j_{m+s-1}\}$.

Using D , a hyperplane can be constructed as follows:

$$\begin{vmatrix} x_1 & \cdots & x_m & y_1 & \cdots & y_s \\ x_{1j_1} & \cdots & x_{mj_1} & y_{1j_1} & \cdots & y_{sj_1} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ x_{1j_{m+s-1}} & \cdots & x_{mj_{m+s-1}} & y_{1j_{m+s-1}} & \cdots & y_{sj_{m+s-1}} \end{vmatrix} = 0, \quad (12)$$

where $x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_s$ are variables, x_{pj_t} , ($p = 1, \dots, m$, $t = 1, \dots, m + s - 1$) is p th input of DMU_{j_t} and y_{qj_t} ($q = 1, \dots, s$; $t = 1, \dots, m + s - 1$) is q th output of DMU_{j_t} .

Suppose that the equation of the above mentioned hyperplane is in the form of $P^t z = 0$, where $z = (x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_s)$, and P is the gradient vector of the hyperplane. Considering Theorem 4, we can find all equations of weak and strong defining hyperplanes of PPS.

Theorem 4: Consider $H = \{z \mid P^t z = 0\}$ so that $P^t z = 0$ is constructed by (12). Suppose $w = (x_1^w, \dots, x_m^w, y_1^w, \dots, y_s^w)$ is defined as follows:

$$x_i^w = \max\{x_{ij} \mid j = 1, \dots, n\} \quad i = 1, \dots, m$$

$$y_r^w = \min\{y_{rj} \mid j = 1, \dots, n\} \quad r = 1, \dots, s$$

Call w Negative Ideal (NI) if

$$P^t z_j = 0 \quad j \in D$$

$$P^t z_j \leq 0 \quad j \in G - D$$

$$P^t w < 0$$

then H is supporting.

Proof. See Jahanshahloo et. al (2007).

Now we are in the position to put all together the ingredients of the method.

Summary of finding all Weak Defining Hyperplanes algorithm

- **Step 1.** Evaluate n DMUs with a suitable form of models (1) and, (2). Hold all CCR-efficient DMUs and remove other DMUs. Put indices of this strong efficient DMUs in E .
- **Step 2.** Evaluate each CCR-efficient DMUs with models (5) and (6). (Note that in the single output case we use model (5) and in the single input case we use model (6)). Denote the

index set of weak efficient virtual DMUs by F . Suppose that $F \cup E = \{DMU_1, \dots, DMU_L\}$ and $G = \{1, \dots, L\}$.

- **Step 3.** For each $p, q \in G$ that $p \neq q$, evaluate $DMU_k = \frac{1}{2}DMU_p + \frac{1}{2}DMU_q$ if it is efficient $p \in G_p$ and $q \in G_p$.
- **Step 4.** For each j ($j = 1, \dots, L$), compute G_j .
- **Step 5.** Choose arbitrary $m + s - 1$ members of G such that $\{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_{m+s-1}\} \subseteq G_{l_1} \cap G_{l_2} \cap \dots \cap G_{l_{m+s-1}}$. Call this set as $D = \{j_1, \dots, j_{m+s-1}\}$.
Construct a hyperplane using equation (12). Suppose that the equation of hyperplane is in the form of $P^t z = 0$ where $z = (x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_s)$.
- **Step 6.** If P has any component less than or equal to zero go to step 8, else let $w = (x_1^w, \dots, x_m^w, y_1^w, \dots, y_s^w)$ is defined as follows:

$$x_i^w = \max\{x_{ij} \mid j = 1, \dots, n\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m$$

$$y_r^w = \min\{y_{rj} \mid j = 1, \dots, n\}, \quad r = 1, \dots, s$$

If

$$P^t z_j = 0, \quad j \in D$$

$$P^t z_j \leq 0, \quad j \in G - D$$

$$P^t w < 0,$$

then $P^t z = 0$ is supporting. Otherwise, go to step 8.

- **Step 7.** If, at least, one of the $m + s - 1$ members of D is a weak efficient virtual DMU, then $P^t z = 0$ is weak defining hyperplane. Otherwise, it is strong defining hyperplane.
- **Step 8.** If another subset of G with $m + s - 1$ members can be found, go to step 5, else stop.

4 Numerical Examples

4.1. Single output case

Table 1 shows data for 4 DMUs with two inputs and one output. Using the CCR model (1), the CCR-efficient DMUs are determined to be D_1, D_2, D_3 . Remove CCR-inefficient DMU D_4 from PPS and solve model (5) corresponding to CCR-efficient DMUs D_1, D_2 and D_3 .

The following results are yielded:

By property 1, DMUs D_1, D_2 and D_3 lie on the extreme rays of the PPS. Model (5) corresponding to DMU D_1 with $l = 2$ and DMU D_3 with $l = 1$ is infeasible. So, by property 3 weak efficient virtual DMUs $D_5 = D'_1 = (1, 4 + \beta, 3)$ and $D_6 = D'_3 = (5 + \alpha, 1, 5)$ lie on the weak defining hyperplanes which pass through the 2th and 1th axis of inputs, respectively. For convenience, we let $\alpha = \beta = 1$. Therefore $E \cup F = \{D_1, D_2, D_3, D_5, D_6\}$ and $G = \{1, 2, 3, 5, 6\}$. Note that model (5) corresponding to DMU D_2 is feasible. So, by property 4, DMU D_2 does not lie on any weak defining hyperplane. Also

$$G_1 = \{1, 2, 5\}, \quad G_2 = \{2, 1, 3\}, \quad G_3 = \{3, 2, 6\}, \quad G_5 = \{1, 5\}, \quad G_6 = \{6, 3\}.$$

$$\{1, 5\} \subseteq G_1 \cap G_5, \quad \{1, 2\} \subseteq G_1 \cap G_2,$$

$$\{2, 3\} \subseteq G_2 \cap G_3, \quad \{3, 6\} \subseteq G_3 \cap G_6.$$

H_1 , the first weak hyperplane, is constructed on $D = \{1, 5\}$.

$$\begin{vmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & y \\ 1 & 4 & 3 \\ 1 & 5 & 3 \end{vmatrix} = 0, \text{ that yields } y = 3x_1.$$

Note that the conditions of Theorem 4 are held and H_1 is a weak defining hyperplane including x_2 -axis and vertical to hyperplane $x_2 = 0$ (because the weak efficient virtual DMU, D'_1 , lies on H_1). Here, $w = (6, 4, 2)$.

H_2 , the second weak hyperplane is constructed on $D = \{3, 6\}$.

$$\begin{vmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & y \\ 5 & 1 & 5 \\ 6 & 1 & 5 \end{vmatrix} = 0, \text{ that yields } y = 5x_2.$$

Similarly, the conditions of Theorem 4 are held, and hence H_2 is a weak defining hyperplane including x_1 -axis and vertical to hyperplane $x_1 = 0$ (because the weak efficient virtual DMU, D'_3 , lies on H_2).

Table 1: Data of Numerical Example 1.

DMU	D1	D2	D3	D4
x_1	1	2	5	6
x_2	4	2	1	1
y	3	4	5	2

Table 2: Example 2. Multiple input and output.

DMU	D_1	D_2	D_3	D_4	D_5
x_1	2	1	2	4	3
x_2	3	2	2	2	5
y_1	7	3	4	6	5
y_2	4	5	3	1	2

Using the proposed method, it was found that DMUs D_1 , D_2 and D_3 rest on edges of the PPS. Also, DMUs D_1 and D_3 lie on the edge intersection of strong and weak defining hyperplanes of the PPS. Moreover, using property 5 there is no any weak defining hyperplane vertical to hyperplane $y = 0$.

4.2. Multiple outputs and inputs case

Table 2 shows data for 5 DMUs with two inputs and two outputs. Running model (1) (or (2)) shows that DMUs D_1 , D_2 , D_4 are CCR-efficient and other DMUs are CCR-inefficient. Applying models (5) and (6) to each CCR-efficient DMU produces the results reported in Table 3. In Table 3, "INFES" and "FES" denotes "infeasible" and "feasible" respectively. For instance, "INFES" in the first row and the second column means that model (5), corresponding to DMU D_1 with $l = 2$, is infeasible. So, by property 3, $D_1^2 = (2, 3 + \alpha, 7, 4)$ is a weak efficient virtual DMU that lies on a weak defining hyperplane passing through x_2 -axis. using property 1, it was found that all CCR-efficient DMUs lie on the extreme ray. Using properties 3 and 6 and the information of Table 3, all weak efficient virtual DMUs can be determined (see Table 4). For simplicity, we choose $\alpha = 1$. For simplicity, we rename CCR-efficient and weak efficient virtual DMUs as follows:

$$U_1 = D_1, U_2 = D_2, U_3 = D_4, U_4 = D_1^2, U_5 = D_1^4, U_6 = D_2^1, U_7 = D_2^2, U_8 = D_2^3, U_9 = D_4^1, U_{10} = D_4^4.$$

Therefore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \{U_1, U_2, U_3\}, & F &= \{U_4, U_5, U_6, U_7, U_8, U_9, U_{10}\}, \\ G &= \{U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4, U_5, U_6, U_7, U_8, U_9, U_{10}\}, \\ G_1 &= \{U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4, U_5, U_7, U_{10}\}, & G_2 &= \{U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4, U_6, U_7, U_8, U_9\}, \\ G_3 &= \{U_1, U_2, U_3, U_5, U_6, U_9, U_{10}\}, & G_4 &= \{U_1, U_2, U_4, U_5, U_7\}, \\ G_5 &= \{U_1, U_3, U_4, U_5, U_{10}\}, & G_6 &= \{U_2, U_3, U_6, U_8, U_9\}, \\ G_7 &= \{U_1, U_2, U_4, U_7, U_8\}, & G_8 &= \{U_2, U_6, U_7, U_8\}, \\ G_9 &= \{U_2, U_3, U_6, U_9, U_{10}\}, & G_{10} &= \{U_1, U_3, U_5, U_9, U_{10}\}. \end{aligned}$$

H_1 , the first weak hyperplane, is constructed on $D1 = \{1, 2, 4\}$, $D2 = \{1, 2, 7\}$, $D3 = \{2, 1, 7\}$, $D4 = \{2, 4, 7\}$,

$$\begin{vmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & y_1 & y_2 \\ 2 & 3 & 7 & 4 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 5 \\ 2 & 4 & 7 & 4 \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & y_1 & y_2 \\ 2 & 3 & 7 & 4 \\ 2 & 4 & 7 & 4 \\ 1 & 3 & 3 & 5 \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & y_1 & y_2 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 5 \\ 2 & 3 & 7 & 4 \\ 1 & 3 & 3 & 5 \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & y_1 & y_2 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 5 \\ 2 & 4 & 7 & 4 \\ 1 & 3 & 3 & 5 \end{vmatrix} = 0$$

that yields $-23x_1 + 6y_1 + y_2 = 0$.

H_2 , the second weak hyperplane, is constructed on $D5 = \{1, 10, 3\}$, $D6 = \{1, 3, 5\}$, $D7 = \{1, 5, 10\}$, $D8 = \{3, 5, 10\}$

$$\begin{vmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & y_1 & y_2 \\ 2 & 3 & 7 & 4 \\ 4 & 2 & 6 & .5 \\ 4 & 2 & 6 & 1 \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & y_1 & y_2 \\ 2 & 3 & 7 & 4 \\ 4 & 2 & 6 & 1 \\ 2 & 3 & 7 & 3 \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & y_1 & y_2 \\ 2 & 3 & 7 & 4 \\ 2 & 3 & 7 & 3 \\ 4 & 2 & 6 & .5 \end{vmatrix} = 0$$

that yields $-4x_1 - 16x_2 + 8y_1 = 0$.

The other weak defining hyperplanes are as follows:

H_3 is constructed on $D9 = \{1, 4, 5\}$ that yields $-7x_1 + 2y_1 = 0$.

H_4 is constructed on $D10 = \{2, 3, 6\}$, $D11 = \{2, 3, 9\}$ and $D12 = \{3, 6, 9\}$ and $D13 = \{2, 6, 9\}$, that yields $-27x_2 + 8y_1 + 6y_2 = 0$.

H_5 is constructed on $D14 = \{3, 10, 9\}$ that yields $-6x_2 + 2y_1 = 0$.

H_6 is constructed on $D15 = \{2, 6, 8\}$ that yields $-5x_2 + 2y_2 = 0$.

H_7 is constructed on $D14 = \{2, 7, 8\}$ that yields $-5x_1 - y_2 = 0$.

One can easily verify that the conditions of Theorem 4 are held and $H_i, i = 1, \dots, 7$ are defining. It is worthwhile to note that the aforementioned PPS has only one strong defining hyperplane

$H_8 : -x_1 - 55x_2 + 17y_1 + 12y_2 = 0$; which is constructed on $D' = \{1, 2, 3\}$.

The following results can be attained by the aforementioned example:

- There are one strong defining hyperplane and seven weak defining hyperplanes.
- The extreme ray binding from DMU U_1 is the intersection of four defining hyperplanes H_1 , H_2 , H_3 and H_8 .
- The extreme ray binding from DMU U_2 is the intersection of five defining hyperplanes H_1 , H_4 , H_6 , H_7 and H_8 .
- The extreme ray binding from DMU U_3 is the intersection of four defining hyperplanes H_2 , H_4 , H_5 and H_8 .
- All extreme rays are the intersection of strong and weak defining hyperplanes. Also all CCR-efficiency DMUs U_1 , U_2 and U_3 lie on the weak defining hyperplanes.

4.3. Real word data

We evaluated the data of 20 branches of a bank in Iran using the proposed method. The data was previously analyzed by Amirteimoori et al. (2005), (see Table (5)). Running the DEA model (1) (or (2)) resulted in seven CCR-efficient units as 1, 4, 7, 12, 15, 17 and 20. Using the proposed method, the equations of weak defining hyperplanes were obtained as summarized below:

The equations of defining hyperplanes binding from DMU_1 :

Table 3: Example 2. The results of evaluation CCR-efficient DMUs by models (5) and (6).

DMU	l		q	
	1	2	1	2
D_1	FES	INFES	FES	INFES
D_2	INFES	INFES	INFES	FES
D_4	INFES	FES	FES	INFES

Table 4: Example 2. Weak efficient virtual DMUs.

DMU	D_1^2	D_1^4	D_2^1	D_2^2	D_2^3	D_4^1	D_4^4
x_1	2	2	2	1	1	5	4
x_2	4	3	2	3	2	2	2
y_1	7	7	3	3	2	6	6
y_2	4	3	5	5	5	1	0

1. $-972780000x_1 - 35830643110x_3 + 14965298195y_1 + 6971185000y_2 = 0$
2. $-8755020000x_1 - 322475787990x_3 + 134687683755y_1 + 62740665000y_2 = 0$
3. $-194556000x_1 - 7166128622x_3 + 2993059639y_1 + 1394237000y_2 = 0$
4. $-1359468485616x_1 - 28494222363367.38x_3 + 12093263476274y_1 + 5939111853909y_2 + 1073596674923.5y_3 = 0$
5. $-97278x_2 - 2645864x_3 + 1152988y_1 + 497000y_2 = 0$
6. $-875502x_2 - 23812776x_3 + 10376892y_1 + 4473000y_2 = 0$
7. $-194556x_2 - 52917280x_3 + 23059760y_1 + 9940000y_2 = 0$
8. $-1359468485616x_2 - 22373297128800x_3 + 10143985960000y_1 + 4371989952000y_2 + 726507524000y_3 = 0$
9. $-943354x_3 + 388133y_1 + 139000y_2 = 0$
10. $-42450930x_3 + 17465985y_1 + 6255000y_2 = 0$
11. $-303325252038x_3 + 125752259800y_1 + 34411902300y_2 + 17703755450y_3 = 0$
12. $-286148x_3 + 96226y_1 + 50000y_2 = 0$
13. $-143074x_3 + 48113y_1 + 25000y_2 = 0$
14. $-100166891292x_3 + 26451830000y_1 + 17352331800y_2 + 49641649000y_3 = 0$

The equations of defining hyperplanes binding from DMU_4 :

1. $-135946848561600x_1 - 2849422236336738x_3 + 1209326347627400y_1 + 593911185390900y_2 + 107359667492350y_3 = 0$
2. $-303325252038x_3 + 125752259800y_1 + 3441190230y_2 + 17703755450y_3 = 0$
3. $-962972121000x_1 - 328314063906x_2 + 888323202000y_1 + 842460036000y_3 = 0$
4. $-69807437340x_1 - 109438021302x_3 + 474497788800y_1 + 535450401000y_3 = 0$

Table 5: Example 3. DMUs' data (extracted from [Amirteimoori et al. (2005), p. 689]).

Branch	input			output		
	Staff	Computer terminals	Space m2	Deposits	Loans	Charge
1	0.9503	0.70	0.1550	0.1900	0.5214	0.2926
2	0.7962	0.60	1.0000	0.2266	0.6274	0.4624
3	0.7982	0.75	0.5125	0.2283	0.9703	0.2606
4	0.8651	0.55	0.2100	0.1927	0.6324	1.0000
5	0.8151	0.85	0.2675	0.2333	0.7221	0.2463
6	0.8416	0.65	0.5000	0.2069	0.6025	0.5689
7	0.7189	0.60	0.3500	0.1824	0.9000	0.7158
8	0.7853	0.75	0.1200	0.1250	0.2340	0.2977
9	0.4756	0.60	0.1350	0.0801	0.3643	0.2439
10	0.6782	0.55	0.5100	0.0818	0.1835	0.0486
11	0.7112	1.00	0.3050	0.2117	0.3179	0.4031
12	0.8113	0.65	0.2550	0.1227	0.9225	0.6279
13	0.6586	0.85	0.3400	0.1755	0.6452	0.2605
14	0.9763	0.80	0.5400	0.1443	0.5143	0.2433
15	0.6845	0.95	0.4500	1.0000	0.2617	0.0982
16	0.6127	0.90	0.5250	0.1151	0.4021	0.4641
17	1.0000	0.60	0.2050	0.0900	1.0000	0.1614
18	0.6337	0.65	0.2350	0.0591	0.3492	0.0678
19	0.3715	0.70	0.2375	0.0385	0.1898	0.1112
20	0.5827	0.55	0.5000	0.1101	0.6145	0.7643

5. $-30930441000x_1 - 48184694626x_2 + 29114103500y_2 + 34847747500y_3 = 0$
6. $-1284492135536300x_1 - 338476850586989x_3 + 861567778754200y_1 + 351625903900200y_2 + 793901952483300y_3 = 0$
7. $-6201072000000x_1 - 63394549535400x_3 + 18021906285000y_2 + 7280349255000y_3 = 0$
8. $-3082802028x_2 - 1303063920x_3 + 2003476500y_2 + 702186000y_3 = 0$
9. $-9415572931881x_2 - 5266914542760x_3 + 9739254084500y_1 + 5725497127500y_2 + 787058521000y_3 = 0$
10. $-315203434864350x_1 - 1925392176272898x_3 + 911363930110150y_1 + 609134934067650y_2 + 116178086881850y_3 = 0$
11. $-402094816405800x_1 - 774926386660479x_3 + 506520288276700y_1 + 385152647434200y_2 + 169409773083050y_3 = 0$
12. $-469929571500x_1 - 5215053344961x_2 - 3555135946650x_3 + 4096877084250y_2 + 1430528892750y_3 = 0$
13. $-49221399250365x_1 - 102872514916490.925x_2 - 209914601960477.7x_3 + 188771599172697.5y_1 + 133350621103897.5y_2 + 22536162160577.5y_3 = 0$
14. $-1396148746800x_1 - 218876042604x_3 + 948995577600y_1 + 1070900802000y_3 = 0$
15. $-498267154301400x_1 - 675598525370802x_3 + 412589517921900y_2 + 312004994380200y_3 = 0$
16. $-7193204732x_2 - 3040482480x_3 + 4674778500y_2 + 1638434000y_3 = 0$
17. $-203698200x_1 - 47097558x_3 + 186109800y_3 = 0$
18. $-209422312020x_1 - 328314063906x_3 + 142349336640y_1 + 160635120300y_3 = 0$

19. $-962972121000x_1 - 328314063906x_2 + 888323202000y_1 + 842460036000y_3 = 0$
20. $-2094223120200x_1 - 328314063906x_3 + 1423493366400y_1 + 1606351203000y_3 = 0$
21. $-588646116x_3 + 257626800y_1 + 73971000y_3 = 0$
22. $-203698200x_1 - 47097558x_3 + 186109800y_3 = 0$
23. $-20670240000x_1 - 211315165118x_3 + 60073020950y_2 + 24267830850y_3 = 0$
24. $-30930441000x_1 - 48184694626x_2 + 29114103500y_2 + 34847747500y_3 = 0$
25. $-156643190500x_1 - 1738351114987x_2 - 1185045315550x_3 + 1365625694750y_2 + 476842964250y_3 = 0$
26. $-49831698600x_1 - 67566609198x_3 + 41263078100y_2 + 31203619800y_3 = 0$
27. $-30930441000x_1 - 48184694626x_2 + 29114103500y_2 + 34847747500y_3 = 0$
28. $-125676913000x_1 - 48184694626x_3 + 49508977400y_2 + 87532406000y_3 = 0$
29. $-125676913000x_1 - 48184694626x_3 + 49508977400y_2 + 87532406000y_3 = 0$
30. $-1027600676x_2 - 434354640x_3 + 667825500y_2 + 234062000y_3 = 0$
31. $-44732808x_2 + 20631000y_2 + 11556000y_3 = 0$
32. $-203698200x_1 - 47097558x_3 + 186109800y_3 = 0$
33. $-203698200x_1 - 47097558x_3 + 186109800y_3 = 0$
34. $-320990707000x_1 - 109438021302x_2 + 296107734000y_1 + 280820012000y_3 = 0$
35. $-30930441000x_1 - 48184694626x_2 + 29114103500y_2 + 34847747500y_3 = 0$
36. $-30930441000x_1 - 48184694626x_2 + 29114103500y_2 + 34847747500y_3 = 0$
37. $-477909287649000x_1 - 338476850586989x_2 + 559061370687500y_1 + 207010083861500y_2 + 360957289402500y_3 = 0$
38. $-429988020954x_2 + 359622357000y_1 + 162565467000y_2 + 64387782000y_3 = 0$
39. $-777810000x_1 - 47097558x_2 + 931920000y_3 = 0$
40. $-30930441000x_1 - 48184694626x_2 + 29114103500y_2 + 34847747500y_3 = 0$
41. $-30930441000x_1 - 48184694626x_2 + 29114103500y_2 + 34847747500y_3 = 0$
42. $-30930441000x_1 - 48184694626x_2 + 29114103500y_2 + 34847747500y_3 = 0$
43. $-30930441000x_1 - 48184694626x_2 + 29114103500y_2 + 34847747500y_3 = 0$
44. $-203698200x_1 - 47097558x_3 + 186109800y_3 = 0$
45. $-2094223120200x_1 - 328314063906x_3 + 1423493366400y_1 + 1606351203000y_3 = 0$
46. $-196215372x_3 + 8587560 + 24657000y_3 = 0$
47. $-62010720000x_1 - 633945495354x_3 + 180219062850y_2 + 72803492550y_3 = 0$
48. $-31520343486435x_1 - 192539217627289.8x_3 + 91136393011015y_1 + 60913493406765y_2 + 11617808688185y_3 = 0$
49. $-49831698600x_1 - 67566609198x_3 + 41263078100y_2 + 31203619800y_3 = 0$
50. $-125676913000x_1 - 48184694626x_3 + 49508977400y_2 + 87532406000y_3 = 0$
51. $-203698200x_1 - 47097558x_3 + 186109800y_3 = 0$
52. $-588646116x_2 + 537594000y_1 + 220161000y_3 = 0$
53. $-89793064x_3 + 17110600y_2 + 8035800y_3 = 0$
54. $-196215372x_2 + 179198000y_1 + 73387000y_3 = 0$
55. $-269379192x_3 + 51331800y_2 + 24107400y_3 = 0$
56. $-600x_3 + 126y_3 = 0$

57. $-135946848561600x_1 - 2849422236336738x_3 + 1209326347627400y_1 + 593911185390900y_2 + 107359667492350y_3 = 0$
58. $-100166891292x_3 + 26451830000y_1 + 17352331800y_2 + 4964164900y_3 = 0$
59. $-1359468485616x_2 - 22373297128800x_3 + 10143985960000y_1 + 4371989952000y_2 + 726507524000y_3 = 0$
60. $-303325252038x_3 + 125752259800y_1 + 34411902300y_2 + 17703755450y_3 = 0$

The equations of defining hyperplanes binding from DMU_7 :

1. $-1284492135536300x_1 - 338476850586989x_3 + 861567778754200y_1 + 351625903900200y_2 + 793901952483300y_3 = 0$
2. $-18000x_1 - 54330x_2 + 50598y_2 = 0$
3. $-8890645750000x_1 - 4649133826135x_2 - 16924059161800x_3 + 14494910015000y_1 + 13845016272500y_2 = 0$
4. $-2163150000x_1 - 1164847275x_2 - 1944747000x_3 + 3260731500y_2 = 0$
5. $-62234520250000x_1 - 32543936782945x_2 - 118468414132600x_3 + 101464370105000y_1 + 96915113907500y_2 = 0$
6. $-721050000x_1 - 388282425x_2 - 648240000x_3 + 1086910500y_2 = 0$
7. $-4200x_1 - 12677x_2 + 11806y_2 = 0$
8. $-9415572931881x_2 - 5266914542760x_3 + 9739254084500y_1 + 5725497127500y_2 + 787058521000y_3 = 0$
9. $-3082802028x_2 - 1303063920x_3 + 2003476500y_2 + 702186000y_3 = 0$
10. $-800158117500x_1 - 4184220443521500x_2 - 1523165324562x_3 + 1304541901350y_1 + 1246051464525y_2 = 0$
11. $-614548655100x_1 - 818367903423x_3 + 609498131850y_1 + 685617039000y_2 = 0$
12. $-477982287300x_1 - 636508369329x_3 + 474054102550y_1 + 533257697000y_2 = 0$
13. $-3605250000x_1 - 1941412125x_2 - 3241245000x_3 + 5434552500y_2 = 0$
14. $-533438745000x_1 - 2789480295681000x_2 - 1015443549708x_3 + 869694600900y_1 + 8307009763500000y_2 = 0$
15. $-614548655100x_1 - 818367903423x_3 + 609498131850y_1 + 685617039000y_2 = 0$
16. $-409699103400x_1 - 545578602282x_3 + 406332087900y_1 + 457078026000y_2 = 0$
17. $-402094816405800x_1 - 77492638660479x_3 + 506520288276700y_1 + 385152647434200y_2 + 169409773083050y_3 = 0$
18. $-1214119364x_2 - 218213520x_3 + 1074571000y_1 + 676494000y_2 = 0$
19. $-9614000x_1 - 5177099x_2 - 8643320x_3 + 14492140y_2 = 0$
20. $-40969295791344900x_1 - 54557041860296577x_3 + 40632599291868150y_1 + 45707116982961000y_2 = 0$
21. $-8498835548x_2 - 1527494640x_3 + 7521997000y_1 + 47354580000y_2 = 0$
22. $-596586144x_2 + 488586000y_1 + 298704000y_2 = 0$
23. $-25236750000x_1 - 13589884875x_2 - 22688715000x_3 + 38041867500y_2 = 0$
24. $-477982287300x_1 - 636508369329x_3 + 474054102550y_1 + 533257697000y_2 = 0$
25. $-65362500x_1 - 46889325x_3 + 70444850y_2 = 0$
26. $-24801090x_1 + 13235861y_2 + 8266595y_3 = 0$
27. $-57054x_2 + 33264y_2 + 6000y_3 = 0$
28. $-1201750000x_1 - 647137375x_2 - 1080415000x_3 + 1811517500y_2 = 0$
29. $-5602500x_1 - 4019085x_3 + 6038130y_2 = 0$
30. $-8412250000x_1 - 4529961625x_2 - 7562905000x_3 + 12680622500y_2 = 0$
31. $-171162x_2 + 99792y_2 + 18000y_3 = 0$
32. $-233428299102x_1 + 127007416523y_1 + 93543291008y_2 + 84460030097y_3 = 0$

33. - 767039328 x_2 + 628182000 y_1 + 384048000 y_2 =0
34. - 12600 x_1 - 38031 x_2 + 3541860 y_2 =0
35. - 6000 x_1 - 1811000 x_2 + 16866 y_2 =0
36. - 409699103400 x_1 -545578602282 x_3 + 406332087900 y_1 + 457078026000 y_2 =0
37. - 5602500 x_1 -4019085 x_3 + 6038130 y_2 =0
38. - 596586144 x_1 + 299539709 y_1 + 415833040 y_2 =0
39. - 65362500 x_1 -46889325 x_3 + 70444850 y_2 =0
40. - 767039328 x_1 + 385122483 y_1 + 534642480 y_2 =0
41. - 10927074276 x_2 -1963921680 x_3 + 9671139000 y_1 + 6088446000 y_2 =0
42. - 70980 x_2 + 42000 y_1 + 38808 y_2 =0
43. - 10140 x_2 + 6000 y_1 + 5544 y_2 =0
44. - 30930441000 x_1 - 48184694626 x_2 + 291141035000 y_2 + 34847747500 y_3 =0
45. - 156643190500 x_1 - 1738351114987 x_2 -1185045315550 x_3 + 1365625694750 y_2 + 476842964250 y_3 =0
46. - 49831698600 x_1 -67566609198 x_3 + 41263078100 y_2 + 31203619800 y_3 =0
47. - 125676913000 x_1 -48184694626 x_3 + 49508977400 y_2 + 87532406000 y_3 =0
48. - 1027600676 x_2 -434354640 x_3 + 667825500 y_2 + 234062000 y_3 =0
49. - 44732808 x_2 + 20631000 y_2 + 11556000 y_3 =0
50. - 477909287649000 x_1 - 338476850586989 x_2 + 559061370687500 y_1 + 207010083861500 y_2 + 360957289402500 y_3 =0
51. - 429988020954 x_2 + 359622357000 y_1 + 162565467000 y_2 + 64387782000 y_3 =0
52. - 7193204732 x_2 -3040482480 x_3 + 4674778500 y_2 + 1638434000 y_3 =0
53. - 469929571500 x_1 - 5215053344961 x_2 -3555135946650 x_3 + 4096877084250 y_2 + 1430528892750 y_3 =0
54. - 492213992503650 x_1 - 1028725149164909.25 x_2 -2099146019604777 x_3 + 1887715991726975 y_1 + 1333506211038975 y_2 + 225361621605775 y_3 =0

The equations of defining hyperplanes binding from DMU_{12} :

1. - 4922139925036500 x_1 -10287251491649092.5 x_2 -20991460196047770 x_3 +18877159917269750 y_1 +13335062110389750 y_2 +2253616216057750 y_3 =0
2. - 20670240000000 x_1 - 211315165118000 x_3 +60073020950000 y_2 +24267830850000 y_3 =0
3. - 49831698600000 x_1 -67566609198000 x_3 +41263078100000 y_2 +31203619800000 y_3 =0
4. - 1566431905000000 x_1 - 173835111498700000 x_2 -118504531555000000 x_3 +136562569475000000 y_2 +47684296425000000 y_3 =0
5. - 315203434864350 x_1 -1925392176272898 x_3 +911363930110150 y_1 +609134934067650 y_2 +116178086881850 y_3 =0
6. - 6201072000000 x_1 -63394549535400 x_3 +18021906285000 y_2 +7280349255000 y_3 =0
7. - 4699295715000000 x_1 -52150533449610000 x_2 - 35551359466500000 x_3 +40968770842500000 y_2 +14305288927500000 y_3 =0
8. - 84122500000000000 x_1 -452996162500000000 x_2 - 75629050000000000 x_3 +126806225000000000 y_2 =0
9. - 56025000000000 x_1 - 40190850000000 x_3 +60381300000000 y_2 =0
10. - 65362500000000 x_1 -46889325000000 x_3 +70444850000000 y_2 =0
11. - 477982287300000 x_1 -636508369329000 x_3 +474054102550000 y_1 +533257697000000 y_2 =0
12. - 622345202500000000 x_1 -325439367829450000 x_2 -1184684141326000000 x_3 +1014643701050000000 y_1 + 969151139075000000 y_2 =0
13. - 25236750000000000 x_1 -135898848750000000 x_2 -22688715000000000 x_3 + 38041867500000000 y_2 =0
14. - 61454865510000 x_1 -81836790342300 x_3 +60949813185000 y_1 +68561703900000 y_2 =0

15. - 7210500000000000 x_1 - 38828242500000000 x_2 - 6482490000000000 x_3 + 10869105000000000 y_2 = 0
16. - 21631500000000000 x_1 - 11648472750000000 x_2 - 19447470000000000 x_3 + 2607315000000000 y_2 = 0
17. - 80015811750000000 x_1 - 41842204435215000 x_2 - 152316532456200000 x_3 + 130454190135000000 y_1 + 124605146452500000 y_2 = 0
18. - 88906457500000000 x_1 - 46491338261350000 x_2 - 169240591618000000 x_3 + 144949100150000000 y_1 + 138450162725000000 y_2 = 0
19. - 12017500000000000 x_1 - 64713737500000000 x_2 - 10804150000000000 x_3 + 18115175000000000 y_2 = 0
20. - 533438745000000000 x_1 - 278948029568100000 x_2 - 1015443549708000000 x_3 + 869694600900000000 y_1 + 830700976350000000 y_2 = 0
21. - 36052500000000000 x_1 - 19414121250000000 x_2 - 32412450000000000 x_3 + 54345525000000000 y_2 = 0
22. - 144691680000000000 x_1 - 1479206155826000000 x_3 + 420511146650000000 y_2 + 169874815950000000 y_3 = 0
23. - 402094816405800 x_1 - 774926386660479 x_3 + 506520288276700 y_1 + 385152647434200 y_2 + 169409773083050 y_3 = 0
24. - 4165274217900000000 x_1 - 5546715789867000000 x_3 + 4131042893650000000 y_1 + 4646959931000000000 y_2 = 0
25. - 13219250000000000 x_1 - 71185111250000000 x_2 - 11884565000000000 x_3 + 19926692500000000 y_2 = 0
26. - 409699103400000 x_1 - 545578602282000 x_3 + 406332087900000 y_1 + 457078026000000 y_2 = 0
27. - 395325000000000 x_1 - 66720000000000 x_3 + 53210100000000 y_2 = 0
28. - 291662435700000 x_1 - 752132978400000 x_3 + 431589130800000 y_1 + 407006674500000 y_2 = 0
29. - 118597500000000 x_1 - 20016000000000 x_3 + 15963030000000 y_2 = 0
30. - 43749365355000 x_1 - 112819946760000 x_3 + 64738369620000 y_1 + 61051001175000 y_2 = 0
31. - 48610405950000 x_1 - 125355496400000 x_3 + 71931521800000 y_1 + 67834445750000 y_2 = 0
32. - 197662500000000 x_1 - 33360000000000 x_3 + 26605050000000 y_2 = 0
33. - 65887500000000 x_1 - 11120000000000 x_3 + 88683500000000 y_2 = 0
34. - 19766250000000000 x_1 - 33360000000000000 x_3 + 26605050000000000 y_2 = 0

The equations of defining hyperplanes binding from DMU_{15} :

1. - 150697636 x_1 + 93188442 y_1 + 101467310 y_3 = 0
2. - 452092908 x_1 + 279565326 y_1 + 304401930 y_3 = 0
3. - 18000 x_1 + 12321 y_1 = 0
4. - 180 x_3 + 81 y_1 = 0
5. - 291657574659405 x_1 - 752120442850360 x_3 + 431581937647820 y_1 + 406999891055425 y_2 = 0
6. - 43749365355 x_1 - 112819946760 x_3 + 64738369620 y_1 + 61051001175 y_2 = 0
7. - 10927074276 x_2 - 1963921680 x_3 + 9671139000 y_1 + 6088446000 y_2 = 0
8. - 4861040595 x_1 - 12535549640 x_3 + 7193152180 y_1 + 6783444575 y_2 = 0
9. - 2916624357 x_1 - 7521329784 x_3 + 4315891308 y_1 + 4070066745 y_2 = 0
10. - 5334387450000 x_1 - 2789480295681 x_2 - 10154435497080 x_3 + 8696946009000 y_1 + 8307009763500 y_2 = 0
11. - 409699103400 x_1 - 545578602282 x_3 + 406332087900 y_1 + 457078026000 y_2 = 0
12. - 8890645750000 x_1 - 4649133826135 x_2 - 16924059161800 x_3 + 14494910015000 y_1 + 13845016272500 y_2 = 0
13. - 233428299102 x_1 + 127007416523 y_1 + 93543291008 y_2 + 84460030097 y_3 = 0
14. - 767039328 x_1 + 385122483 y_1 + 534642480 y_2 = 0
15. - 1214119364 x_2 - 218213520 x_3 + 1074571000 y_1 + 676494000 y_2 = 0
16. - 80015811750000 x_1 - 41842204435215 x_2 - 152316532456200 x_3 + 130454190135000 y_1 + 124605146452500 y_2 = 0

17. - $614548655100x_1 - 818367903423x_3 + 609498131850y_1 + 685617039000y_2 = 0$
18. - $8498835548x_2 - 1527494640x_3 + 7521997000y_1 + 4735458000y_2 = 0$
19. - $596586144x_1 + 299539709y_1 + 415833040y_2 = 0$
20. - $62234520250000x_1 - 32543936782945x_2 - 118468414132600x_3 + 101464370105000y_1 + 96915113907500y_2 = 0$
21. - $477982287300x_1 - 636508369329x_3 + 474054102550y_1 + 533257697000y_2 = 0$
22. - $767039328x_2 + 628182000y_1 + 384048000y_2 = 0$
23. - $596586144x_2 + 488586000y_1 + 298704000y_2 = 0$
24. - $402094816405800x_1 - 774926386660479x_3 + 506520288276700y_1 + 385152647434200y_2 + 169409773083050y_3 = 0$
25. - $49221399250365x_1 - 102872514916490.925x_2 - 209914601960477.7x_3 + 188771599172697.5y_1 + 133350621103897.5y_2 + 22536162160577.5y_3 = 0$
26. - $477909287649000x_1 - 338476850586989x_2 + 559061370687500y_1 + 207010083861500y_2 + 360957289402500y_3 = 0$
27. - $9415572931881x_2 - 5266914542760x_3 + 9739254084500y_1 + 5725497127500y_2 + 787058521000y_3 = 0$
28. - $320990707000x_1 - 109438021302x_2 + 296107734000y_1 + 280820012000y_3 = 0$
29. - $962972121000x_1 - 328314063906x_2 + 888323202000y_1 + 842460036000y_3 = 0$
30. - $698074373400x_1 - 109438021302x_3 + 474497788800y_1 + 535450401000y_3 = 0$
31. - $196215372x_2 + 179198000y_1 + 73387000y_3 = 0$
32. - $1284492135536300x_1 - 338476850586989x_3 + 861567778754200y_1 + 351625903900200y_2 + 793901952483300y_3 = 0$
33. - $429988020954x_2 + 359622357000y_1 + 162565467000y_2 + 64387782000y_3 = 0$
34. - $588646116x_2 + 537594000y_1 + 220161000y_3 = 0$
35. - $196215372x_3 + 85875600y_1 + 24657000y_3 = 0$
36. - $315203434864350x_1 - 1925392176272898x_3 + 911363930110150y_1 + 609134934067650y_2 + 116178086881850y_3 = 0$
37. - $2094223120200x_1 - 328314063906x_3 + 1423493366400y_1 + 1606351203000y_3 = 0$
38. - $588646116x_3 + 257626800y_1 + 73971000 = 0$
39. - $135946848561600x_1 - 2849422236336738x_3 + 1209326347627400y_1 + 593911185390900y_2 + 107359667492350y_3 = 0$
40. - $194556x_2 - 5291728x_3 + 2305976y_1 + 994000y_2 = 0$
41. - $97278x_2 - 2645864x_3 + 1152988y_1 + 497000y_2 = 0$
42. - $972780000x_1 - 35830643110x_3 + 14965298195y_1 + 6971185000y_2 = 0$
43. - $875502x_2 - 23812776x_3 + 10376892y_1 + 4473000y_2 = 0$
44. - $42450930x_3 + 17465985y_1 + 6255000y_2 = 0$
45. - $1359468485616x_2 - 22373297128800x_3 + 10143985960000y_1 + 4371989952000y_2 + 726507524000y_3 = 0$
46. - $303325252038x_3 + 125752259800y_1 + 34411902300y_2 + 17703755450y_3 = 0$
47. - $194556000x_1 - 7166128622x_3 + 2993059639y_1 + 1394237000y_2 = 0$
48. - $943354x_3 + 388133y_1 + 139000y_2 = 0$

The equations of defining hyperplanes binding from DMU_{17} :

1. - $972780000x_1 - 35830643110x_3 + 14965298195y_1 + 6971185000y_2 = 0$
2. - $8890645750000x_1 + 4649133826135x_2 - 16924059161800x_3 + 14494910015000y_1 + 13845016272500y_2 = 0$
3. - $8755020000x_1 - 322475787990x_3 + 134687683755y_1 + 62740665000y_2 = 0$
4. - $80015811750000x_1 + 41842204435215x_2 - 152316532456200x_3 + 130454190135000y_1 + 124605146452500y_2 = 0$

5. - $721050000x_1 + 388282425x_2 - 648249000x_3 + 1086910500y_2 = 0$
6. - $658875x_1 - 1112000x_3 + 886835y_2 = 0$
7. - $62234520250000x_1 + 32543936782945x_2 - 118468414132600x_3 + 101464370105000y_1 + 96915113907500y_2 = 0$
8. - $62010720000x_1 - 633945495354x_3 + 180219062850y_2 + 72803492550y_3 = 0$
9. - $6000x_1 + 18110x_2 + 16866y_2 = 0$
10. - $5334387450000x_1 + 2789480295681x_2 - 10154435497080x_3 + 8696946009000y_1 + 8307009763500y_2 = 0$
11. - $492213992503650x_1 + 1028725149164909.25x_2 - 2099146019604777x_3 + 1887715991726975y_1 + 1333506211038975y_2 + 225361621605775y_3 = 0$
12. - $4861040595x_1 - 12535549640x_3 + 7193152180y_1 + 6783444575y_2 = 0$
13. - $469929571500x_1 + 5215053344961x_2 - 3555135946650x_3 + 4096877084250y_2 + 1430528892750y_3 = 0$
14. - $43749365355x_1 - 112819946760x_3 + 64738369620y_1 + 61051001175y_2 = 0$
15. - $42000x_1 + 126770x_2 + 118062y_2 = 0$
16. - $395325x_1 - 667200x_3 + 532101y_2 = 0$
17. - $3605250000x_1 + 1941412125x_2 - 3241245000x_3 + 5434552500y_2 = 0$
18. - $315203434864350x_1 - 1925392176272898x_3 + 911363930110150y_1 + 609134934067650y_2 + 116178086881850y_3 = 0$
19. - $2916624357x_1 - 7521329784x_3 + 4315891308y_1 + 4070066745y_2 = 0$
20. - $2916580607634645x_1 - 7521216964053240x_3 + 4315826569630380y_1 + 4070005693998825y_2 = 0$
21. - $25236750000x_1 + 13589884875x_2 - 22688715000x_3 + 38041867500y_2 = 0$
22. - $2163150000x_1 + 1164847275x_2 - 1944747000x_3 + 3260731500y_2 = 0$
23. - $20670240000x_1 - 211315165118x_3 + 60073020950y_2 + 24267830850y_3 = 0$
24. - $206681729760000x_1 - 2112940336014882x_3 + 600670136479050y_2 + 242654040669150y_3 = 0$
25. - $1976625x_1 - 3336000x_3 + 2660505y_2 = 0$
26. - $194556000x_1 - 7166128622x_3 + 2993059639y_1 + 1394237000y_2 = 0$
27. - $18000x_1 + 5433x_2 + 50598y_2 = 0$
28. - $135946848561600x_1 - 2849422236336738x_3 + 1209326347627400y_1 + 593911185390900y_2 + 107359667492350y_3 = 0$
29. - $126000x_1 + 380310x_2 + 354186y_2 = 0$
30. - $1201750000x_1 + 647137375x_2 - 1080415000x_3 + 1811517500y_2 = 0$
31. - $11859750000000x_1 - 20016000000000x_3 + 15963030000000y_2 = 0$
32. - $10700580000x_1 - 394137074210x_3 + 164618280145y_1 + 76683035000y_2 = 0$
33. - $97278x_2 - 2645864x_3 + 1152988y_1 + 497000y_2 = 0$
34. - $9415572931881x_2 - 5266914542760x_3 + 9739254084500y_1 + 5725497127500y_2 + 787058521000y_3 = 0$
35. - $875502x_2 - 23812776x_3 + 10376892y_1 + 4473000y_2 = 0$
36. - $8498835548x_2 - 1527494640x_3 + 7521997000y_1 + 4735458000y_2 = 0$
37. - $74061281204x_2 - 13311024720x_3 + 65548831000y_1 + 41266134000y_2 = 0$
38. - $70980x_2 + 42000y_1 + 38808y_2 = 0$
39. - $57054x_2 + 33264y_2 + 6000y_3 = 0$
40. - $3082802028x_2 - 1303063920x_3 + 2003476500y_2 + 702186000y_3 = 0$
41. - $300x_2 + 180y_2 = 0$
42. - $194556x_2 - 5291728x_3 + 2305976y_1 + 994000y_2 = 0$

43. - $171162x_2 + 99792y_2 + 18000y_3 = 0$
44. - $1359468485616x_2 - 22373297128800x_3 + 10143985960000y_1 + 4371989952000y_2 + 726507524000y_3 = 0$
45. - $1214119364x_2 - 218213520x_3 + 1074571000y_1 + 676494000y_2 = 0$
46. - $10927074276x_2 - 1963921680x_3 + 9671139000y_1 + 6088446000y_2 = 0$
47. - $10700580x_2 - 291045040x_3 + 126828680y_1 + 54670000y_2 = 0$
48. - $1027600676x_2 - 434354640x_3 + 667825500y_2 + 234062000y_3 = 0$
49. - $10140x_2 + 6000y_1 + 5544y_2 = 0$
50. - $89793064x_3 + 17110600y_2 + 8035800y_3 = 0$
51. - $3000x_3 + 615y_2 = 0$
52. - $2693791920x_3 + 51331800y_2 + 24107400y_3 = 0$
53. - $143074x_3 + 48113y_1 + 25000y_2 = 0$
54. - $100166891292x_3 + 26451830000y_1 + 17352331800y_2 + 4964164900y_3 = 0$

The equations of defining hyperplanes binding from DMU_{20} :

1. - $1284492135536300x_1 - 338476850586989x_3 + 861567778754200y_1 + 351625903900200y_2 + 793901952483300y_3 = 0$
2. - $698074373400x_1 - 109438021302x_3 + 474497788800y_1 + 535450401000y_3 = 0$
3. - $125676913000x_1 - 48184694626x_3 + 49508977400y_2 + 87532406000y_3 = 0$
4. - $30930441000x_1 - 48184694626x_2 + 29114103500y_2 + 34847747500y_3 = 0$
5. - $77781000x_1 - 47097558x_2 + 93192000y_3 = 0$
6. - $962972121000x_1 - 328314063906x_2 + 888323202000y_1 + 842460036000y_3 = 0$
7. - $2094223120200x_1 - 328314063906x_3 + 1423493366400y_1 + 1606351203000y_3 = 0$
8. - $320990707000x_1 - 109438021302x_2 + 296107734000y_1 + 280820012000y_3 = 0$
9. - $477909287649000x_1 - 338476850586989x_2 + 559061370687500y_1 + 207010083861500y_2 + 360957289402500y_3 = 0$
10. - $248010900x_1 + 132358610y_2 + 82665950y_3 = 0$
11. - $233428299102x_1 + 127007416523y_1 + 93543291008y_2 + 84460030097y_3 = 0$
12. - $452092908x_1 + 279565326y_1 + 304401930y_3 = 0$
13. - $150697636x_1 + 93188442y_1 + 101467310y_3 = 0$
14. - $45858x_1 + 34962y_3 = 0$
15. - $203698200x_1 - 47097558x_3 + 186109800y_3 = 0$
16. - $1396148746800x_1 - 218876042604x_3 + 948995577600y_1 + 1070900802000y_3 = 0$

It is worthwhile to note that there are 216 weak defining hyperplanes and there is only one strong defining hyperplane that is constricted on DMUs 4, 7, 12, 15, 17.

5 Conclusions

Until now, less attention has been paid regarding finding *weak* facet of PPS of DEA models (see Wei et al. (2007)). Following Jahanshahloo et al. (2007), in this paper we proposed a method for finding all weak defining hyperplanes of the PPS of the CCR model. To do this, the performance of each DMUs was firstly evaluated using models (1) or (2), and all CCR-inefficient cases from the PPS were then removed. By introducing a variance of super-efficient models (see models (5) and (6)) and using properties 2-7, the weak efficient virtual DMUs and the strong efficient DMUs are found. A supporting hyperplane was found to be a weak defining hyperplane if at least one weak efficient virtual DMU lies on it. Using the proposed method, one can check which CCR-efficient DMUs lie on the extreme rays (edges) of the PPS of the CCR model; which extreme DMUs lie on the weak defining hyperplanes, and how many defining hyperplanes they are on. In addition, these hyperplanes are useful in sensitivity and stability analysis. Our algorithm can easily be implemented using existing packages for operation research, such as GAMS.

References

- Amirteimoori A., Kordrostami S., 2005. "Efficient surfaces and an efficiency index in DEA: a constant returns to scale", *Applied Mathematics and Computation* , 163 683-691.
- Amirteimoori A., Kordrostami S., 2012. "Generating strong defining hyperplanes of the production possibility set in data envelopment analysis". *Applied Mathematics Letters*, 25 (3) 605-609.
- Banker R.D., 1984. "Estimation most productive scale size using data envelopment analysis". *European Journal of Operational Research*, 17 35-44.
- Banker R.D., Thrall R.M., 1992. "Estimation of returns to scale using data envelopment analysis". *European Journal of Operational Research*, 62 (2) 74-84.
- Banker R.D., Charnes A., Cooper W.W., 1984. "Some models for estimating technical and scale inefficiencies in data envelopment analysis". *Management Science* 30 (9) 1078-1092.
- Bazaraa M., Shetty C.M., 1990. *Linear Programming and Network Flows*, John Wiley & Sons.
- Charnes A., Cooper W.W., Rodes E., 1978. "Measuring the efficiency of decision making units", *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2 (6) 429-444.
- Cooper W.W., Seiford L.M., Tone K., 2000. "Data Envelopment Analysis: a comprehensive text with models, applications, references, and DEA-Solver software", Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Davtalab-Olyaie M., Roshdi I., Partovi Nia V., Asgharian D., 2014. "On characterizing full dimensional weak facets in DEA with variable returns to scale technology". *Optimization*, 163 483-488.
- Fukuyama H., Mirdehghan S.M., 2012. "Identifying the efficiency status in network DEA". *European*

Journal of Operational Research 220 85-92.

- Hosseinzadeh Lotfi F., Jahanshahloo G.R., Mozaffari M.R., Gerami J., 2011. "Finding DEA-efficient hyperplanes using MOLP efficient faces". *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 235 1227-1231.
- Jahanshahloo G.R., Hosseinzadeh Lotfi F., Shoja N., Sanei M., Tohidi G., 2005a. "Sensitivity and stability analysis in DEA". *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 169 897-904.
- Jahanshahloo G.R., Hosseinzadeh Lotfi F., Zhiani Rezai H. and Rezai Balf F., 2007. "Finding Strong Defining Hyperplanes of Production Possibility Set". *European Journal of Operational Research* 25(3) 605-609.
- Jahanshahloo G.R., Hosseinzadeh Lotfi F., Zohrehbandian M., 2005b. "Finding the piecewise linear frontier production function in data envelopment analysis". *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 163 483-488.
- Jahanshahloo G.R., Shirzadi A., Mirdehghan S.M., 2009. "Finding strong defining hyperplanes of PPS using multiplier form". *European Journal of Operational Research*, 194 (3) 933-938.
- Jahanshahloo G.R., Hosseinzadeh Lotfi F., Akbarian D., 2010. "Finding weak defining hyperplanes of PPS of the BCC model". *Applied Mathematical Modelling* 34 (11) 3321-3332.
- Olesen O.B. and Petersen N.C., 2003. "Identification and use of efficient faces and facets in DEA". *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, 20 323-360.
- Seiford L.M. and Thrall R.M., 1990. "Recent developments in DEA, The mathematical programming approach to frontier analysis". *Journal of Econometrics*. 46 7-38.
- Wei Q.L., Yan H. and Hao G., 2007. "Characteristics and structures of weak efficient surfaces of production possibility sets". *Journal of Mathematics Analysis and Application*. 327 1055-1074.
- Yu G., Wei Q., Brockett P. and Zhou L., 1996. "Construction of all DEA efficient surfaces of the production possibility set under the Generalized Data Envelopment Analysis Model. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 95 (3) 491-510.




Figure 1: Strong and weak defining hyperplanes of the PPS; Property 3,




Figure 2: Properties 2 and 6.




Figure 3: Property 5




Figure 4: Example 1.